

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 00-1169**

---

JOE EDWARD MOORE, JR.,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

CITY OF SUMTER, SOUTH CAROLINA; PERRY REGIS-  
TER, Personnel Director; HAROLD B. JOHNSON,  
Chief; PATTY JAYE PATTERSON, Major; AL B.  
ATKINSON, Captain,

Defendants - Appellees.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of  
South Carolina, at Columbia. Matthew J. Perry, Jr., Senior Dis-  
trict Judge. (CA-98-3410-3-10)

---

Submitted: June 20, 2000

Decided: August 1, 2000

---

Before MURNAGHAN and LUTTIG, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON, Senior  
Circuit Judge.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Joe Edward Moore, Jr., Appellant Pro Se. Kathryn Thomas, GIG-  
NILLIAT, SAVITZ & BETTIS, Columbia, South Carolina, for Appellees.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.  
See Local Rule 36(c).

PER CURIAM:

Joe Edward Moore, Jr., appeals the district court's order granting summary judgment to the Defendants on his 42 U.S.C.A. § 1983 (West Supp. 2000) complaint. We have reviewed the record and the district's opinion and find no reversible error with respect to the grant of summary judgment to the individual Defendants. See City of Dallas v. Stanglin, 490 U.S. 19, 25 (1989); Fogarty v. Boles, 121 F.3d 886, 890 (3d Cir. 1997); Wagner v. Wheeler, 13 F.3d 86, 90-91 (4th Cir. 1993). Moreover, because Moore fails to identify any unconstitutional policy, custom, or practice of the City of Sumter, South Carolina, we find the district court properly granted summary judgment to the City to the extent Moore attempted to rely upon a respondeat superior theory. Monell v. Department of Social Servs., 436 U.S. 658, 694 (1978); Jackson v. Long, 102 F.3d 722, 731 (4th Cir. 1996). Accordingly, we affirm on the reasoning of the district court. See Moore v. City of Sumter, No. CA-98-3410-3-10 (D.S.C. Jan. 18, 2000). We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED